



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/616,379

07/09/2003

Skott C. Klebe

C0011/7004

1320

64967

7590

12/16/2008

LAW OFFICES OF PAUL E. KUDIRKA

40 BROAD STREET

SUITE 300

BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

TRUVAN, LEYNN A THANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2435

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/616,379

Applicant(s)

KLEBE, SKOTT C.

Examiner

Leynna T. Truvan

Art Unit

2435

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/28/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 are currently amended reciting "wherein words in each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content". This is new matter that was not disclosed originally. Examiner finds pages 14-16 of the specification discusses related description or what most closely describes this new material. However, pages 14-16 does not particularly teach the claimed wherein words in each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 2/15/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per argument on pg.8, regarding the 112, 1st paragraph rejection. Applicant indicated the claimed "wherein words in each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content" was added to clarify the meaning of the term "fragmenting". Examiner is unaware of the term fragmenting as known in the computer art defined or known as applicant claims. Examiner points to another USC 112 rejection (see below) to consider if it was the case that the claim did limit the term fragmenting to mean "wherein words...in the digital content". Examiner does not see the claims reciting in a way as to define fragmenting but broadly interprets this limitation as an additional process to the multi-words that was fragmented.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Additionally, the passage applicant points to in the specification [08] is not similar to the claimed. The examiner finds this passage not related or in the same context as what applicant defines for the claimed fragmenting. Innuendo, that applicant's scrambling is given in light of fragmenting and fragmenting is interpreted as "wherein words in each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content", this passage does not coincide with what is claimed either. First, the passage recites that scrambling produces a scrambled text file that contains nearly all of the words in the original documents and most of the phrases. Nearly and most does not mean or equivalent as "words in

each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content". Second, the passage recites "contains" nearly all whereas the claimed recites the words are "arranged" in an the same order. Third, the passage states that a text file contains nearly or most all of the words whereas the claim is for each multi-word phrases being arranged in the same order. Although, the passage mentions multi-word phrases, but the passage seems to describe that it is the file that "contains...in the original document and most of the phrases" and not the phrases as containing nearly all the words. Thus, the passage focuses on the file versus the claimed focuses on multi-word phrases. Hence, there is no evidence in the specification that supports the new subject matter previously amended and does not find the claimed interpretation the same or similar as the specification.

* Although, examiner finds the amendment containing new subject matter as not originally filed, these new limitations will be rejected as well.

As per argument on pg.10, regarding Giradot 's invention and that applicant finds it not possible to reconstruct the document at the destination if randomly assembled at the source. Giradot as stated by applicant on pg.9, encoding involves fragmenting the document and pg.10 acknowledges Giradot randomly assembling the fragments into a scramble document and at the destination reassemble and reconstruct the document structure. Thus, Giradot reads on the claimed randomly assembling the phrases into a scrambled document. The reassembling and reconstructing and as recited on pg.68-2.3 and pg.70-5 suggests the claimed "wherein words in each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content", as the claimed invention does not limit when or where fragmenting the text stream is done. Lui is combined with Giradot to teach the sentences and/or

phrases are made up of multiple (more than one) words and sentences/phrases consist of more than one phrase (col.31, lines 38-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Girardot with Luis to teach sentence and phrase construction (Lui-col.24, lines 6-9) because to prevent the tedious repetition of phrases (Lui-col.30, lines 35-66) and has the distinct advantage of reducing data production (Lui-col.31, lines 18-40). Thus, Girardot clearly reads on the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Girardot, et al. (Efficient Representation and Streaming of XML Content Over the Internet Medium) and further in view of Lui, et al. (US 6,340,977).

As per claim 1:

Girardot discloses a method for distributing secure digital content that can be indexed by third party search engines, the method comprising:

(a) generating a text stream from the digital content by stripping all graphic information and punctuation from the digital content; (pg.67-abstract and pg.68-3.)

(b) fragmenting the text stream into *[multi-word]* phrases, wherein words in each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content; (pg.68-2.3 and pg.70-5.)

(c) randomly assembling the phrases into a scrambled document; and **(pg.68 and 69)**

(d) making the scrambled document available to the third party search engines. **(pg.69)**

Although, it is obvious fragmenting the documents is likely to include phrases and multi-word phrases of Girardot, et al., but did not clearly discuss multi-word phrases.

Lui, et al teaches the invention that relates to software for assisting users, and more particularly to a system and method for interactively assisting a user operating an application program (col.1, lines 17-20). Lui includes a Cooperative Help Assistance (CHA) system and method provides real-time user assistance for one or more window-based GUI applications or a single application's different subsections such as web pages (col.2, lines 35-40). Lui discloses the combined data and assembled or constructed data elements during sequence processing in new combinations where many elements such as Commentary i.e. language phrases expressed from the CHA system are combined during user actions and requests during the session with the Host Application (col.22, lines 55 - col.23, line 3). The Commentary Assembly Module does rapid sentence and phrase construction for non-essential data type (col.24, lines 6-9). Further, Lui discloses the CHA system includes a mechanism to assemble optional Commentary and provides feedback to the user and contributes to the learning experience (col.30, lines 35-47). The CHA system includes such a mechanism not only for providing such commentary, but also to create phrases and sentences dynamically to prevent the tedious repetition of phrases (col.30, lines 47-50). The assembly of commentary objects is performed by the Commentary Assembly

Module where the Commentary data set may include different target categories of fragments that are grammatically compatible and interchangeable according to a set of language rules. The Commentary Set may also include categories that are organized phrases that can be assembled in run time into many different combinations to generate an extensive variety of phrases or expressions (col.30, lines 55-60). Lui discloses the Commentary sentences and phrases can be created and rendered according to the selected data format by concatenating ASCII text or assembling sound fragments as in a play list or files (col.30, lines 63-66). In addition, Lui discusses assembling these phrases at runtime has the distinct advantage of reducing data production and such assembling of phrases also contributes to the personality of the learning or interactive experience (col.31, lines 18-22). The sentences and/or phrases disclosed in Lui obviously are made up of multiple (more than one) words and sentences/phrases consist of more than one phrase (col.31, lines 38-40). Thus, reads on the claimed multi-word phrases.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Girardot with Luis to teach a CHA system includes Commentary Assembly Module for rapid sentence and phrase construction (Lui-col.24, lines 6-9), that involves Commentary data set to generate an extensive variety of (multi-word) sentences and phrases and a mechanism to create phrases and sentences dynamically because to prevent the tedious repetition of phrases (Lui-col.30, lines 35-66) and has the distinct advantage of reducing data production (Lui-col.31, lines 18-40).

As per claim 2: See Lui on col.24, lines 6-9 and col.30, lines 35-66: discussing a method of claim 1 wherein step (b) comprises parsing the text stream to generate a word stream and fragmenting the word stream into phrases, where each phrase contains at least two words.

As per claim 3: See Girardot on pg.68 and Luis on col.1, lines 34-40: discussing the method of claim 2 wherein the total number of words in a phrase is random.

As per claim 4: See Lui on col.24, lines 6-9 and col.30, lines 35-66: discussing the method of claim 3 wherein the total number of words in a phrase has a maximum of five words.

As per claim 5: See Girardot on pg.68 and Luis on col.24, lines 6-9 and col.30, lines 35-66; discussing the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) comprises forming a stream of phrases and randomly swapping the position of phrases in the phrase stream.

As per claim 6: See Girardot on col.1, lines 60-65 and col.3, lines 47-52: discussing the method of claim 1 further comprising: (e) returning the scrambled document content when the scrambled document is indexed by the third party search engines.

As per claim 7: See Girardot on pg.69-70: discussing a method of claim 6 wherein step (e) comprises examining a user agent parameter to determine whether a search engine or a browser is requesting the scrambled document.

As per claim 8: See Girardot on col.1, lines 19-24 and 59-65: discussing the method of claim 6 further comprising: (f) returning a link to an owner of the secure content when a browser links from the search engine to the indexed scrambled document.

As per claim 9: See Girardot on pg.67-68: discussing the method of claim 8 wherein the scrambled document contains a script routine that loads a web page provided by the secure content owner and step (f) comprises running the script routine after the scrambled document content has been loaded into the browser.

As per claim 10: See Girardot on pg.67-68: discussing the method of claim 9 wherein step (f) comprises using the script routine to hide the scrambled text from a user.

As per claim 11:

Girardot discloses apparatus for distributing secure digital content that can be indexed by third party search engines, the apparatus comprising:

a stripper that generates a text stream from the digital content by stripping all graphic information and punctuation from the digital content; **(pg.67-abstract and pg.68-3.)**

means for fragmenting the text stream into *[multi-word]* phrases, wherein words in each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content; **(pg.68-2.3 and pg.70-5.)**

a stream assembler that randomly assembles the phrases into a scrambled document; and **(pg.68 and 69)**

means for making the scrambled document available to the third party search engines. **(pg.68 and 69)**

Although, Girardot discloses fragmenting the text stream into phrases, but did not clearly discuss multi-word phrases.

Lui, et al teaches the invention that relates to software for assisting users, and more particularly to a system and method for interactively assisting a user operating an application program (col.1, lines 17-20). Lui includes a Cooperative Help Assistance (CHA) system and method provides real-time user assistance for one or more window-based GUI applications or a single application's different subsections such as web pages (col.2, lines 35-40). Lui discloses the combined data and assembled or constructed data elements during sequence processing in new combinations where many elements such as Commentary i.e. language phrases expressed from the CHA system are combined during user actions and requests during the session with the

Host Application (col.22, lines 55 - col.23, line 3). The Commentary Assembly Module does rapid sentence and phrase construction for non-essential data type (col.24, lines 6-9). Further, Lui discloses the CHA system includes a mechanism to assemble optional Commentary and provides feedback to the user and contributes to the learning experience (col.30, lines 35-47). The CHA system includes such a mechanism not only for providing such commentary, but also to create phrases and sentences dynamically to prevent the tedious repetition of phrases (col.30, lines 47-50). The assembly of commentary objects is performed by the Commentary Assembly Module where the Commentary data set may include different target categories of fragments that are grammatically compatible and interchangeable according to a set of language rules. The Commentary Set may also include categories that are organized phrases that can be assembled in run time into many different combinations to generate an extensive variety of phrases or expressions (col.30, lines 55-60). Lui discloses the Commentary sentences and phrases can be created and rendered according to the selected data format by concatenating ASCII text or assembling sound fragments as in a play list or files (col.30, lines 63-66). In addition, Lui discusses assembling these phrases at runtime has the distinct advantage of reducing data production and such assembling of phrases also contributes to the personality of the learning or interactive experience (col.31, lines 18-22). The sentences and/or phrases disclosed in Lui obviously are made up of multiple (more than one) words and sentences/phrases consist of more than one phrase (col.31, lines 38-40). Thus, reads on the claimed multi-word phrases.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Girardot with Luis to teach a CHA system includes Commentary Assembly Module for rapid sentence and phrase construction (Lui-col.24, lines 6-

9), that involves Commentary data set to generate an extensive variety of (multi-word) sentences and phrases and a mechanism to create phrases and sentences dynamically because to prevent the tedious repetition of phrases (Lui-col.30, lines 35-66) and has the distinct advantage of reducing data production (Lui-col.31, lines 18-40).

As per claim 12: See Lui on col.24, lines 6-9 and col.30, lines 35-66: discussing the apparatus of claim 11 wherein the means for fragmenting comprises a parser that parses the text stream to generate a word stream and a fragmenter that fragments the word stream into phrases, where each phrase contains at least two words.

As per claim 13: See Girardot on pg.67 and Luis on col.22, lines 64-67 and col.30, lines 35-66: discussing the apparatus of claim 12 wherein the total number of words in a phrase is random.

As per claim 14: See Lui on col.8, lines 44-47 and col.15, lines 49-53: discussing the apparatus of claim 13 wherein the total number of words in a phrase has a maximum of five words.

As per claim 15: See Girardot on col.2, lines 26-40 and col.3, lines 24-35: discussing the apparatus of claim 11 wherein the stream assembler comprises means for forming a stream of phrases and means for randomly swapping the position of phrases in the phrase stream.

As per claim 16: See Girardot on pg.68-69: discussing the apparatus of claim 11 further comprising means for returning the scrambled document content when the scrambled document is indexed by the third party search engines.

As per claim 17: See Girardot on col.3, lines 42-52 and col.4, lines 4-10: discussing the apparatus of claim 16 wherein the means for returning the scrambled document content

comprises means for examining a user agent parameter to determine whether a search engine or a browser is requesting the scrambled document.

As per claim 18: See Girardot on pg.67: discussing the apparatus of claim 16 further comprising means for returning a link to an owner of the secure content when a browser links from the search engine to the indexed scrambled document.

As per claim 19: See Girardot on pg.68-69: discussing the apparatus of claim 18 wherein the scrambled document contains a script routine that loads a web page provided by the secure content owner and the means for returning a link to an owner of the secure content comprises means for running the script routine after the scrambled document content has been loaded into the browser.

As per claim 20: See Girardot on pg.67-68: discussing the apparatus of claim 19 wherein the script routine comprises means for hiding the scrambled text from a user.

As per claim 21:

Girardot discloses a computer program product for distributing secure digital content that can be indexed by third party search engines, the computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code thereon, including:

program code for generating a text stream from the digital content by stripping all graphic information and punctuation from the digital content; (pg.67-abstract and pg.68-3.)

program code for fragmenting the text stream into *[multi-word]* phrases, wherein words in each multi-word phrase remain arranged in an order that is the same as an order in which those words are arranged in the digital content; (pg.68-2.3 and pg.70-5.)

program code for randomly assembling the phrases into a scrambled document; and
(pg.68 and 69)

program code for making the scrambled document available to the third party search engines. **(pg.68 and 69)**

Although, Girardot discloses fragmenting the text stream into phrases, but did not clearly discuss multi-word phrases.

Lui, et al teaches the invention that relates to software for assisting users, and more particularly to a system and method for interactively assisting a user operating an application program (col.1, lines 17-20). Lui includes a Cooperative Help Assistance (CHA) system and method provides real-time user assistance for one or more window-based GUI applications or a single application's different subsections such as web pages (col.2, lines 35-40). Lui discloses the combined data and assembled or constructed data elements during sequence processing in new combinations where many elements such as Commentary i.e. language phrases expressed from the CHA system are combined during user actions and requests during the session with the Host Application (col.22, lines 55 - col.23, line 3). The Commentary Assembly Module does rapid sentence and phrase construction for non-essential data type (col.24, lines 6-9). Further, Lui discloses the CHA system includes a mechanism to assemble optional Commentary and provides feedback to the user and contributes to the learning experience (col.30, lines 35-47). The CHA system includes such a mechanism not only for providing such commentary, but also to create phrases and sentences dynamically to prevent the tedious repetition of phrases (col.30, lines 47-50). The assembly of commentary objects is performed by the Commentary Assembly Module where the Commentary data set may include different target categories of fragments that

are grammatically compatible and interchangeable according to a set of language rules. The Commentary Set may also include categories that are organized phrases that can be assembled in run time into many different combinations to generate an extensive variety of phrases or expressions (col.30, lines 55-60). Lui discloses the Commentary sentences and phrases can be created and rendered according to the selected data format by concatenating ASCII text or assembling sound fragments as in a play list or files (col.30, lines 63-66). In addition, Lui discusses assembling these phrases at runtime has the distinct advantage of reducing data production and such assembling of phrases also contributes to the personality of the learning or interactive experience (col.31, lines 18-22). The sentences and/or phrases disclosed in Lui obviously is made up of multiple (more than one) words and sentences/phrases consist of more than one phrase (col.31, lines 38-40). Thus, reads on the claimed multi-word phrases.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Girardot with Luis to teach a CHA system includes Commentary Assembly Module for rapid sentence and phrase construction (Lui-col.24, lines 6-9), that involves Commentary data set to generate an extensive variety of (multi-word) sentences and phrases and a mechanism to create phrases and sentences dynamically because to prevent the tedious repetition of phrases (Lui-col.30, lines 35-66) and has the distinct advantage of reducing data production (Lui-col.31, lines 18-40).

As per claim 22: See Girardot on pg.68 and Luis on col.24, lines 6-9 and col.30, lines 35-66: discussing the computer program product of claim 21 wherein the program code for fragmenting the text stream comprises program code for parsing the text stream to generate a

word stream and program code for fragmenting the word stream into phrases, where each phrase contains at least two words.

As per claim 23: See Girardot on pg.67 and Luis on col.22, lines 64-67 and col.30, lines 35-66: discussing the computer program product of claim 22 wherein the total number of words in a phrase is random.

As per claim 24: See Lui on col.24, lines 6-9 and col.31, lines 38-40: discussing the computer program product of claim 23 wherein the total number of words in a phrase has a maximum of five words.

As per claim 25: See Girardot on pg.67 discussing the computer program product of claim 21 wherein the program code for randomly assembling the phrases into a scrambled document comprises program code for forming a stream of phrases and program code for randomly swapping the position of phrases in the phrase stream.

As per claim 26: See Girardot on pg.68-69: discussing the computer program product of claim 21 further comprising program code for returning the scrambled document content when the scrambled document is indexed by the third party search engines.

As per claim 27: See Girardot on pg.67: discussing the computer program product of claim 26 wherein the program code for returning the scrambled document content comprises program code for examining a user agent parameter to determine whether a search engine or a browser is requesting the scrambled document.

As per claim 28: See Girardot on pg.67: discussing the computer program product of claim 26 further comprising program code for returning a link to an owner of the secure content when a browser links from the search engine to the indexed scrambled document.

As per claim 29: See Girardot on pg.68-69: discussing the computer program product of claim 28 wherein the scrambled document contains a script routine that loads a web page provided by the secure content owner and the program code for returning the scrambled document content comprises program code for running the script routine after the scrambled document content has been loaded into the browser.

As per claim 30: See Girardot on pg.67: discussing the computer program product of claim 29 wherein the script routine comprises program code for hiding the scrambled text from a user.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leynna T. Truvan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. T. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2435

/Kimyen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435